

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTY.'S DOCKET: KURODA=5

In re Application of:)	Confirmation No.: 1808
)	
Hitoshi KURODA et al)	Art Unit: 1772
)	
I.A. Filing Date: 07/03/2003)	Examiner: W. P. Watkins
371(c) Date: January 31, 2005)	
)	June 14, 2007
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/522,677)	
)	
For: SURFACE-TREATED RESIN)	
FILM, METAL SHEET...)	

REPLY TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment
Honorable Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the restriction requirement Office Action mailed May 16, 2007, and reply below.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

Restriction has been required among what the PTO deems as being nine (9) patentably distinct inventions, purportedly based on lack of unity of invention under the applicable PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2. As applicants must make

an election even though the requirement is traversed, applicant hereby respectfully and provisionally elect Group I, presently claims 1-14, with traverse and without prejudice.

Claim 15, Group XI, depends from claim 1 and incorporates the subject matter thereof. These claims share the same or corresponding special technical feature, it being noted that applicants claim not only a surface roughness in general, but a surface roughness of a particular value.

Claims 17 and 18 of Group II also share the same or corresponding special technical feature.

Claims 22, 23 and 25 of Group VI also share the same or corresponding special technical feature.

Claim 24 of Group VII depends from and incorporates the subject matter of claim 15 (Group VIII) which, as indicated above, shares the same or corresponding special technical feature with the elected subject matter.

Accordingly, the requirement should be at least partly withdrawn and plural groups should be examined. Such is respectfully requested.

Applicants note for the record that there appears to be a typographical error with regard to Group VIII, as it lists claim 25 which is also listed in Group VI. Applicants assume that Group VIII was intended to comprise claim 26

Appln. No. 10/522,677
Amd. dated June 14, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 16, 2007

rather than claim 25. Clarification of the record in this regard would be appreciated.

Applicants respectfully await the results of a first examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By /SN/
Sheridan Neimark
Registration No. 20,520

SN:kg
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\T\TOYO\KURODA5\pto\2007-06-14PCTRPLYRESTRICT.doc